

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on August 18, 2005 has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes presented herewith, taken with following remarks, are believed sufficient to place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The drawings have been objected to under CFR 1.83(a) for not showing "deformation of the optic". Claims 23-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188351 ("Laguette"). Claims 1-22 and 28-31 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 32-61 have been added for consideration by the Examiner. The drawings conform to CFR 1.83(a).

The Examiner has asserted that the drawings do not show "deformation of the optic". Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion and contends that FIGS. 1 and 2 illustrate a deformation of the optic 24 and the capsular bag 22. Further, deformation is described in the specification, both explicitly and inherently. However, in an effort to further clarify deformation of optic, as taught in the specification and claims of the instant application as originally filed, Applicant has added FIGS. 11 and 12 for consideration by the Examiner. No new matter has been entered by added FIGS. 11 and 12, which illustrate subject matter contained at least in the paragraph starting on page 17, line 20 of the specification as originally filed. For clarification, the referenced paragraph has been amended to provide designator labels for the elements already discussed in this paragraph, as well as to point out certain characteristics of lenses and IOLs understood by those of normal skill within the art.

Claims 23-27 Are Not Anticipated by Laguette.

Claims 23-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Laguette. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for reasons discussed in greater detail below. Applicant has amended claim 23 to more clearly claim certain aspects of the invention. Claims 1-22 and 28-31 are cancelled without prejudice and applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in the current application or in a continuation or divisional application.

Laguette does not teach all the limitation of independent claim 23 as amended. For example, Laguette does not teach or suggest a continuous outer ring surrounding the optic and spaced therefrom, the continuous outer ring configured for implantation within a capsular bag of an eye. Laguette also fails to teach or suggest intermediate members extending between and connecting an optic and an outer ring.

At least because Laguette does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 23, Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate that amended claim 23 is allowable. Claims 24-27 depend from claim 23 and further define the invention of claim 23. Thus, claims 24-27 are patentable over Laguette at least for the same reasons that claim 23 is patentable thereover, and are patentable in their own right as well.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 23-27 and new claims 32-61 are allowable over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant earnestly seeks a notice of allowance and prompt issuance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 502317.

Respectfully submitted,
Advanced Medical Optics

Dated: November 18, 2005

By: 

David Weber
Registration No. 51,149
Agent of Record
Customer No. 33357
(714) 247-8232